

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Case No. 2:13-cr-00054-KJD-DJA

**Plaintiff,**

V.

JOSHUA CROFT,

#### Defendants.

**ORDER GRANTING THE  
GOVERNMENT'S MOTIONS TO  
STRIKE**

Before the Court are the government's Motions to Strike *Pro Se* Pleadings (ECF #94/98/103). Defendant did not respond to the motions. After Defendant filed his *pro se* motions, including a motion to dismiss counsel and proceed *pro se*, he filed a motion to withdraw his motion to dismiss counsel (ECF #101).

## I. Analysis

Defendant Joshua Croft (“Croft”) filed his *pro se* motions while awaiting his revocation of supervised release hearing. (ECF #94, at 2). The Local Rules for the United States District Court, District of Nevada state that “a party who has appeared by attorney cannot while so represented appear or act in the case. This means that once an attorney makes an appearance on behalf of a party, that party may not personally file a document with the court; all filings must thereafter be made by the attorney.” LR IA 11-6(a). Croft’s attorney was retained as counsel on December 14, 2021. (ECF #94, at 3). Because Croft is represented by counsel, he may not file documents with the Court. As such, his motions are stricken. Additionally, while the government did not request that Croft’s Motion to Withdraw Motion to Dismiss Counsel (ECF #101) be stricken, it was also filed *pro se* while Croft was represented. Therefore, the Court strikes that motion as well.

11

## II. Conclusion

Accordingly, IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that the government's Motions to Strike *Pro Se* Pleadings (ECF #94/98/103) are GRANTED.

IT IS FURTHER ORDERED that Defendant's motions (ECF #93/97/101/102) are stricken from the record.

Dated this 2nd day of May, 2022.

  
Kent J. Dawson  
United States District Judge